



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: FEBRUARY 1, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0320

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication	Not Sustained - Unfounded

Named Employee #2

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication	Not Sustained - Unfounded

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections are written in the first person.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Complainant, a police lieutenant, alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) and Named Employee #2 (NE#2) were dishonest when they filed “false” equal employment opportunity (EEO) complaints against him.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On January 22, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA’s investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

A. OPA Complaint

On August 2, 2024, the Seattle Human Resources Investigations Unit forwarded to OPA a complaint on the Complainant’s behalf. The Complainant alleged, in part, that “[the named] employees can continue to file false [EEO] complaints against me and they won’t be investigated even when there is evidence of lies in their complaints.” The Complainant further stated that he could “point to exact evidence of the lies in both cases.”

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing news articles, EEO investigations and interviews, emails and texts, and an SPD memo. OPA also interviewed the Complainant and named employees.

B. Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Allegations

Named Employee #1’s Allegations



- (1) NE#1 alleged that the Complainant had made advances toward her by inviting her to a trip to Las Vegas with other SPD officers to watch a football game. She alleged that he misled her into spending time alone with him, invited her to dinner where he bragged about his dating experiences and sexual ability, and arranged a meeting to watch a football game at the hotel, only to find that she was the sole attendee.
- (2) NE#1 alleged that the Complainant provided negative performance evaluations in retaliation for rejecting his advances, resulting in her being overlooked for a promotion to a sergeant.

Named Employee #2's Allegations

- (1) NE#2 alleged that the Complainant engaged in discriminatory and harassing behavior by removing pictures of white canine officers from his office. She alleged that he reacted with anger and tasked her with researching the canine officers' accomplishments after she inquired about their removal.
- (2) NE#2 alleged that the Complainant regularly mentioned her being a diversity hire for the canine unit and indicated that her colleagues had disliked her.
- (3) NE#2 alleged sexual harassment, claiming that the Complainant positioned himself closely and contacted her knee using his knee during several private discussions in his closed-door office.
- (4) NE#2 alleged that the Complainant tried to persuade her to live with him after she told him her residence was unsuitable for a canine.

C. OPA Interviews

Complainant

On December 18, 2024, OPA interviewed the Complainant. He said he was not NE#1's supervisor at the time he invited her to Las Vegas, so she was not obligated to attend. He accused NE#1 of sexualizing and sensationalizing the trip, suggesting that she had been coached to make sexual harassment and discrimination claims against him. He maintained that NE#1's sexual harassment claims were unfounded, particularly since she elected to work under him in the public affairs unit. He said he rejected her request to undergo emergency medical technician (EMT) training based on operational needs rather than gender discrimination. He said EMT training was unnecessary within the public affairs unit. He acknowledged her dissatisfaction with his decision but informed her that she could pursue EMT training if she returned to patrol, a decision she decided against. He characterized his relationship with her as friendly, noting that they had spent time together socially and shared meals on occasion. He refuted any allegations of making sexual advances toward NE#1 or engaging in sexual discussions with her. He also denied having conversations about dating or expressing any romantic interest in her. He mentioned that NE#1 often expressed dissatisfaction with her boyfriend, prompting him to offer her guidance as he would to a younger sister. He claimed that NE#1 had made advances toward him, which ultimately led to her departure from the public affairs unit. He expressed his opposition to NE#1's promotion, believing she required remedial training for her conduct, but insisted that he did not block it. He claimed to be unaware of her removal from the promotion list, attributing that decision to the chief.

The Complainant refuted NE#2's claim about his removal of pictures featuring white canine officers from his office, stating that his motivation was to display personal pictures instead. He said he had the authority to remove pictures from the entire canine unit but had only redecorated his own office. He said NE#2 dated Witness Officer #1 (WO#1) from the canine unit, who had exhibited problematic behavior and poor performance, leading to unfavorable performance evaluations. He said NE#2 became antagonistic toward him due to her association with WO#1. He claimed that NE#2 was untruthful, as the EEO investigator provided her with an opportunity to report any instances of sexual harassment during her EEO interview, which she chose not to do. He said NE#2 claimed sexual harassment a year afterward, alleging that he had touched her knee with his knee. He denied inappropriately touching NE#2 or



having a sexual conversation with her. He said he called NE#2 into his office, which he described as small, to discuss work-related matters. He also denied offering NE#2 to live with him.

Named Employee #1

On December 18, 2024, OPA interviewed NE#1. She said the Complainant encouraged her to join the Community Police Team, but she believed she was too inexperienced to apply. She said he appeared to offer her considerable opportunities and attention that were not extended to other officers. She felt as though he was guiding her on how to achieve success within the department. She said he encouraged her to make sacrifices for her colleagues since she was unmarried and had no children, which led her to feel unable to refuse his requests. She said he motivated her to take the sergeant's exam, which she ultimately did, despite concerns regarding her inexperience. She said he encouraged her to join the canine unit, but she declined due to a lack of interest, which seemed to disappoint him. She said she accepted his encouragement to join the public affairs unit. She denied having romantic feelings toward him but regarded him as a mentor. Nonetheless, she claimed that he would often remark that she was a great catch.

NE#1 said the Complainant extended an invitation for a trip to Las Vegas, which was expected to be attended by other officers and could benefit her career. She said her interactions occurred in both group and private settings. She said he mentioned inviting a group of officers to his hotel to watch a football game by the pool, but she found herself alone upon her arrival. She expressed discomfort, especially as she was in a swimsuit, and claimed that he commented on her appearance and stared at her. She said she accepted his proposal to see the view from his hotel room and eat at a steakhouse, believing no inappropriate conduct would occur. She said she admired the view from his hotel room but felt uncomfortable because he stood behind her, stared at her, and commented on her appearance, prompting her to leave. She said she dined with him at the steakhouse and returned to Seattle the following day.

NE#1 said her interactions with the Complainant became increasingly unprofessional and stressful over time. For instance, she mentioned his refusal to allow her to attend training necessary for maintaining her EMT certification, citing staffing issues. She said she received approval from the training unit, which incited his anger and led to a lengthy meeting where he accused her of insubordination, yelled at her, and insulted her. She said he claimed that the public affairs unit disliked her and spread rumors about her alleged insubordination. She said she requested a transfer due to a hostile work environment, but the chief encouraged her to remain, believing that the conflict between NE#1 and the Complainant was merely a "misunderstanding." She said she was assured that changes would be implemented, but then the EEO investigator pressured her to sign a mentorship plan, which she declined, perceiving it as a disciplinary measure. She claimed that an EEO complaint was filed against her for insubordination, and the Complainant said he did not wish to hinder her promotion but would disclose everything. She said she was overlooked for a promotion until six months later.

Named Employee #2

On December 18, 2024, OPA interviewed NE#2. She said the Complainant gravitated toward her after they met. She said she worked an overnight shift with the Complainant, who directed her to accompany him back to the West Precinct shortly after they began their shift. She expressed discomfort when he called her "cute" like NE#1, noting that she did not know NE#1 at that time. She said the Complainant suggested they dine at a restaurant located beyond their patrol boundary. She said he repeatedly called her cute at the restaurant, where they dined for over an hour. She said she joined the canine unit and encountered NE#1, who told her that the Complainant was assisting her with preparing for the sergeant's exam. She said the Complainant reached out to her over a year later, encouraging her to apply for a canine handler position to promote diversity. However, she said her motivation was not driven by this



reason, as she believed she would apply when the timing was right. She felt that the canine unit already had a diverse representation. She said she ultimately applied and became a canine handler. She claimed that the Complainant seemed to focus on her during training by reaching out to her specifically, unlike others.

NE#2 said the Complainant was defensive when she asked about the removal of pictures from his office. She said he questioned her about the commonality of the pictures, to which she said they depicted only white officers. She said he replied, "You said it, not me." She said he directed her to research the white canine officers, which she interpreted as a punitive task. She said he told her that she was a diversity hire and suggested that the canine officers disliked her and wished for her to be removed from the unit, a claim she disputed based on contrary statements from the canine officers. She alleged that he frequently summoned her to his office and closed the door behind her, which made her uncomfortable, as he did not extend the same treatment to other officers. She described the office as cramped, often feeling cornered to the extent that their knees would touch. She said her apartment was an unsuitable place for her canine, leading him to propose that she move in with him, a suggestion she found unsettling. She said after she relocated to a house, he insisted on conducting a solo inspection, a request she found odd given his lack of dog handling training. She said he also asked that her roommates be absent. She said she refused to disclose her address. She said WO#1 conducted the inspection instead, which incited the Complainant's anger.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was dishonest in her EEO complaint against him.

Department employees must be truthful and complete in all communications. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11.

Under the Seattle Police Officers' Guild Collective Bargaining Agreement (SPOG CBA), a sustained complaint involving dishonesty "relating to the administration of justice" carries a presumption of termination. SPOG CBA article 3.1. In such cases, dishonesty is defined as "intentionally providing false information, which the officer knows to be false, or intentionally providing incomplete responses to specific questions, regarding facts that are material to the investigation." *Id.* Dishonesty means "more than mere inaccuracy or faulty memory." *Id.* For termination cases where "the alleged offense is stigmatizing to a law enforcement officer," an "elevated standard of review (i.e. – more than preponderance of the evidence)" applies. *Id.*

This allegation is unfounded. OPA found insufficient evidence supporting this allegation, even when evaluated under the lower preponderance standard rather than the elevated standard of review as specified in the SPOG CBA. While there is agreement between the involved parties regarding certain occurrences—specifically, that NE#1 participated in the Las Vegas trip, had her EMT certification training denied, and was not selected for a promotion—the parties disagree on the motivations behind these events and their interpretations of what transpired. For instance, NE#1 claimed that the Complainant isolated her and made sexual advances during the Las Vegas trip, while the Complainant claimed that NE#1 sexualized and sensationalized the trip and was coached to allege sexual harassment. In another instance, NE#1 claimed that she was overlooked for a promotion due to the Complainant's false insubordination report, while the Complainant claimed that he did not obstruct her promotion, believed she needed remedial training for her behavior, and attributed her promotion denial to the chief. Under these circumstances, OPA cannot determine that NE#1's EEO claims were untruthful based on the evidence provided, as her allegations arose from her interpretations of the events that occurred.



Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 was dishonest in her EEO complaint against him.

This allegation is unfounded. OPA found insufficient evidence supporting this allegation, even when evaluated under the lower preponderance standard rather than the elevated standard of review as specified in the SPOG CBA. There is agreement between the involved parties regarding the removal of pictures from NE#1's office but disagreement on the reasons for it. NE#2 claimed that the Complainant removed the pictures of the white canine officers from his office based on discrimination, while the Complainant claimed that he removed them to redecorate his office. A mere difference in interpretation cannot constitute dishonesty on its own. Moreover, the other EEO claims against the Complainant cannot be disproved based on the evidence provided. Although the Complainant denied engaging in any sexual conversation with NE#2, inappropriately touching her in his office, or offering her to live with him, OPA did not find sufficient evidence to favor one account over the other.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**